

## Interview Summary

Application No.  
**09/005,006**

Applicant(s)  
**Kanno et al**

Examiner  
**N. M. Nguyen**

Group Art Unit  
**1754**

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) N. M. Nguyen

(3) Mr. Sato

(2) Mr. Warren Zitlau

(4) Mr. Kanno

Date of Interview Jan 23, 2002

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic      b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes      e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: all in general

Identification of prior art discussed:  
Rossin

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Discussd the possibility of submitting a 132 declaration to show unexpected results of an alumina catalyst with a specific amount of nickel oxide.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.